

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 12, 14, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-31 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-31 under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by CORBA and ORB (Orfali et al., OMG, Iona, Mowbray et al, and Rymer).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. As amended, claim 1 recites “dynamically creating a mapping of said client to said server at run time in response to a request from said client for a connection to said server”, which is supported in the specification without limitation on pages 21-24 with respect to the description of Figures 8A and 8B. An ORB, such as a CORBA ORB, only provides a static means of communication across object models and is not capable of dynamically passing a message from one object model to an incompatible object model without prior knowledge of the desired object model or method. ORBs typically use an IDL to specify the interfaces of client and server objects. Specifically, an IDL is used to pre-define a mapping prior to run time between the client and server objects, e.g., by the creation of static client and server IDL stubs (see, for example, Orfali pages 1-2, Iona 3/23, Mowbray 37-42). Thus, with a typical ORB, such as an ORB conforming to CORBA, a mapping between a client and a server must be defined before run time and is not dynamically created at run time as recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

As amended, claim 12 recites “dynamically create a mapping of said client to said server at run time in response to a request from said client for a connection to said server”. Therefore, it is believed that claim 12 is also allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 13-21 depend from claim 12 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

As amended, claim 22 recites “dynamically create a mapping between said first object and said second object at run time in response to a request from said first object for a connection

to said second object". Therefore, it is believed that claim 22 is also allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 23-26 depend from claim 22 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

As amended, claim 27 recites "dynamically creating a proxy object and a stub object at run time in response to a request from said client for a connection to said server". Therefore, it is believed that claim 27 is also allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 28-30 depend from claim 27 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

As amended, claim 31 recites "dynamically creating a mapping of said client to said server at run time". Therefore, it is believed that claim 31 is also allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5-12-06



Amita Pugalia  
Registration No. 57,367  
V 408-973-2580  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014